



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/990,837	11/14/2001	James Clough	10013803-1	3028

7590 12/23/2005  
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

CHEA, PHILIP J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2153

DATE MAILED: 12/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/990,837	Applicant(s) CLOUGH ET AL.	
	Examiner Philip J. Chea	Art Unit 2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 and 33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 and 33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to an Amendment filed October 7, 2005. Claims 1-24,33 are currently pending. Any rejection not set forth below has been overcome by the current Amendment.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. Claims 1,4,6,7,9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yan et al. (US 6,003,065), herein referred to as Yan, and further in view of Farros et al. (US 6,717,686), herein referred to as Farros.

As per claims 1 and 12, Yan disclose a method for loading a file on a server, as claimed, comprising:

- communicating a file from a client to the server, the file containing information (see columns 22 and 23, lines 57-67 and 1-12, where server is considered the host, and the client is considered the peripheral device, and the file is implied because the host knows about the peripheral device);
- generating an applet based on the information (see columns 22 and 23, lines 57-67 and 1-12, where generation is implied by downloading the applet onto the device);
- communicating the applet from the server to the client (see columns 22 and 23, lines 57-67 and 1-12);
- executing the applet on the client (see columns 23 and 24, lines 66-67 and 1-4); and
- communicating to the server (see columns 23 and 24, lines 66-67 and 1-4, where the server sees the effects of the newly updated driver).

Although the system disclosed by Yan shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose that the executing causes searching for an additional file, and communicating the additional file to the server.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Yan, as evidenced by Farros.

Art Unit: 2153

In an analogous art, Farros discloses that it would have been obvious to put printer information in a file (see columns 10 and 11, lines 62-67 and 1-2).

Given the teaching of Yan which shows executing an applet on a client to receive printer information such as amount of paper available, amount of toner, etc. (see columns 23 and 24, lines 66-67 and 1-4), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Yan by executing the applet on the client to cause searching for this file containing printer information and communicating the file to the server, such as disclosed by Farros, in order to have printer information located on a single entity so that fetching the printer information once would give the server information about the amount of paper available, amount of toner, etc. instead of fetching it each time to get each individual information.

As per claim 4, Yan in view of Farros further disclose that the server comprises a printer server (see Yan column 17, lines 39-52).

As per claim 6, Yan in view of Farros further disclose that the information comprises file names (see Yan column 23, lines 47-53).

As per claim 7, Yan in view of Farros further disclose that the information comprises a file name associated with the additional file (see Yan columns 23 and 24, lines 66-67 and 1-4).

As per claim 9, Yan in view of Farros further disclose searching a memory associated with a camera (see Yan column 24, lines 28-40).

As per claim 10, Yan in view of Farros further disclose searching for an image file (see Yan column 24, lines 28-40).

As per claim 11, Yan in view of Farros further disclose that the executing includes invoking a request for a user's input (see Yan columns 22 and 23, lines 57-67 and 1-12).

2. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yan in view of Farros as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Skibbie et al. (US 6,910,128), herein referred to as Skibbie.

Art Unit: 2153

Although the system disclosed by Yan in view of Farros shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose that the applet comprises a security signature.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Yan in view of Farros, as evidenced by Skibbie.

In an analogous art, Skibbie discloses a system for verifying applet signatures (see Abstract).

Given the teaching of Skibbie, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Yan in view of Farros by employing signed applets, such as disclosed by Skibbie, in order to determine if a an applet is allowed to be executed in a particular environment.

3. Claims 13,18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adolfsson (US 6,092,078), and further in view of Wood et al. (US 6,732,162), herein referred to as Wood.

As per claims 13,21, Adolfsson discloses a method for loading a file on a server, as claimed, comprising:

- communicating a file from a client to the server, the file containing information (see column 5, lines 21-24, where file is considered the initial request);
- generating an applet based on the information (see column 5, lines 50-60);
- communicating the applet from the server to the client (see column 5, lines 50-60);
- executing the applet on the client (see column 5, lines 50-60);
- communicating to the server (see column 50-60); and
- configuring the Web server (see column 5, lines 61-64).

Although the system disclosed by Adolfsson shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose searching by the client for an additional file.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Adolfsson, as evidenced by Wood.

In an analogous art, Wood discloses configuring a Web server by allowing a client to search for an additional file and upload the file through an applet (see column 5, lines 21-48).

Art Unit: 2153

Given the teaching of Wood, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Adolfsson teaching of configuring the layout for a web page by employing an option to upload images to the web server through the use of an applet, such as disclosed by Wood, in order to allow a web master to individually select images and upload them to the server.

As per claim 18, Adolfsson in view of Wood further disclose that the information comprises file names (see column 5, lines 21-48).

As per claim 19, Adolfsson in view of Wood further disclose that the information comprises a file name associated with the additional file (see column 5, lines 21-48).

As per claim 20, Adolfsson in view of Wood further disclose that it would have been obvious for the client to search a CD in a CD-ROM drive because it is old and well known that images among other types of data can be stored on CDs. A person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that putting images on a CD allows for portability and sharing.

As per claim 22, Adolfsson in view of Wood disclose that the additional file comprises an image file (see Wood column 5, lines 21-48).

As per claim 23, Adolfsson in view of Wood disclose that the configuring comprises associating the additional file with a Web page (see Wood column 5, lines 21-48).

As per claim 24, Adolfsson in view of Wood disclose that the additional file comprises an image file associated with a Web page hosted by the Web server (see Wood column 5, lines 21-48).

4. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adolfsson in view of Wood as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Farros et al. (US 6,717,686), herein referred to as Farros.

Although the system disclosed by Adolfsson in view of Wood shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose that the server comprises a printer server.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Adolfsson in view of Wood, as evidenced by Farros.

Art Unit: 2153

In an analogous art, Farros discloses uploading an image to a printing facility which may be sent to a user when completed (see Abstract).

Given the teaching of Farros, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Adolfsson in view of Wood by employing a printer server, such as disclosed by Farros, in order to allow a user to print digital images and have the images sent to them when completed.

5. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adolfsson in view of Wood as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Skibbie et al. (US 6,910,128), herein referred to as Skibbie.

Although the system disclosed by Adolfsson in view of Wood shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose that the applet comprises a security signature.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Adolfsson in view of Wood, as evidenced by Skibbie.

In an analogous art, Skibbie discloses a system for verifying applet signatures (see Abstract).

Given the teaching of Skibbie, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Adolfsson in view of Wood by employing signed applets, such as disclosed by Skibbie, in order to determine if a an applet is allowed to be executed in a particular environment.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

6. Claim 33 is allowed.

7. Claims 2,3,8,14,15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2153

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments filed October 7, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

(A) Applicant contends that Yan in view of Farros provides no evidence as to the searching in claim 1.

(B) Applicant contends that Yan in view of Farros fails to disclose searching a memory associated with a camera as recited in claim 9.

(C) Applicant contends that Adolfsson in view of Wood fails to show searching by the client for an additional file.

In considering (A), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Yan reference shows that printer information can be transmitted from a printer to a server. Farros shows that printer information can be stored in a file. The Examiner believes that at the time of the invention a person skilled in the art would find it obvious to transfer a single file containing all the printer information to the server in order to reduce the number of transfer and fetch requests. Given the combined teachings, the Examiner considers the act of searching for the file is implied, if not inherent. The printer conducts the searching when it retrieves its own printer information file, and transmits the file to a server upon a request. Even if the location of the file is already known, going to the location and retrieving the file is basis enough to fulfill the searching requirement.

In considering (B), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner believes that allowing the camera to download instructions and image data to the printer implies searching a camera memory. The camera searches its own memory for the instructions and image data once the communication between the printer and camera has been established by the virtual machine and applets. Therefore, memory of the camera must be searched to find the instructions and image data it would like to print.

In considering (C), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Wood discloses that once executed, the applet allows a user to search for media objects to upload. The claim language is broad enough where it



Art Unit: 2153

can be interpreted in a way that allows a user to manually search for the additional file and still fulfill the limitation.

### ***Conclusion***

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip J. Chea whose telephone number is 571-272-3951. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00-4:30 (1st Friday Off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Philip J Chea  
Examiner

Art Unit: 2153

Art Unit 2153

PJC 12/13/05



**KRISNA LIM**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**